

REMARKS


Applicant requests reconsideration and further examination of this application.

Applicant appreciates the indication that Claims 5 and 6 are allowable, if written in independent format with the limitations of the main and intervening claims and if the Section 112, second paragraph rejection (of Claims 5 and 6) is solved. The text of the Examiner's Detailed Action on page 3 states that "Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable", but the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 4 on page 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Dixon and has not rejected Claims 5 and 6 on any other grounds than Section 112, second paragraph. Therefore, the undersigned believes that the text on page 3 contains a typographical error and the Examiner meant to write "Claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten . . .".

In response, Applicant has amended Claim 5 and 6 to each contain the limitations of Claims 1 - 4. In doing so, the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections have been solved, as Claim 5 now contains antecedent basis for "said inlet chamber" and Claim 6 now contains antecedent basis for "the outlet chamber."

Applicant now believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Respectfully submitted,


Ken J. Pedersen, Registration No. 29,689
Barbara S. Pedersen, Registration No. 36,237
P.O. Box 2666
Boise, ID 83701-2666
Telephone: 208-343-6355
Facsimile: 208-343-6341

Date: 2/6/04